

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 8, 2005**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Julie Aitken, Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Deputy Manager Marcie Nolan, Planner David Abramson and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. James Aucamp, Jr. was absent

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** January 25, 2005

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of January 25, 2005. In a voice vote, with Mr. Aucamp being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**3. SITE PLANS**

**3.1 SP 6-11-04, Forest Lawn Funeral Home – Newman’s Subdivision, 6530 State Road 84 (B-2)  
(tabled from January 11, 2005)**

Richard Hartmann and John Haley, representing the petitioner, were present. As the applicant had not provided a revised site plan, the Committee worked from minutes and new renderings in order to evaluate the changes which had been made.

Mr. Hartmann stated that he understood that the only changes to be made were to the building architecture and that additional striping had been requested. Ms. Nolan interjected that the Committee had clearly recommended a drop-off area and since that had not been addressed, the meeting was “open ended” as to the Committee’s recommendation.

Mr. Hartmann advised that he had discussed the issue with the “operations” people from the funeral home. It had been their policy that in inclement weather, to also utilize the covered drop-off which was originally designated for the hearse and limousines for family members. Vice-Chair Aitken recalled that the issue of a designated drop-off was a concern for the elderly or infirm to have easy access even in good weather.

Chair Breslau suggested that the Committee systematically go through the comments made at the previous meeting and so they proceeded. With the exception of the drop-off overhang, Mr. Hartmann agreed to the cross-hatching in the parking area and on the sidewalks; that there was additional excess parking; and that there were sidewalks providing connectivity from parking to the building. Pointing to staff’s site plan, Chair Breslau suggested that a parking space and some landscaping at the front door be removed in order to allow for a designated drop-off space to be implemented. Mr. Hartmann indicated that he had no problem with what Chair Breslau had suggested. Vice-Chair Aitken stated that it was an improvement; however, it would need to go back to staff to be sure that it met Code.

Using renderings of each elevation, Mr. Hartmann briefly clarified the architectural changes and the materials to be used. There was a brief discussion regarding the garage doors and Mr. Hartmann agreed to arch the top of the opening.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and these items: 1) that the applicant reconfigure the parking on the north side of the building to allow a designated drop-off sidewalk that would extend from the front of the building to the driveway; 2) that on the west side of the building, under the covered area abutting the building and flush with the driveway, to provide a four-foot area along the entire length of the building done in pavers for a pedestrian walkway; 3) that the garage door on the east side be a paneled

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 8, 2005**

garage door and that the structure over the top of it be arched similar to the entrance way; and 4) that the final site plan and landscaping plans be submitted to staff for review of the changes to determine if they were compliant with Code. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**3.2 SP 8-10-04, Diamond III, 10230 West State Road 84 (CC)**

Christian Klink, Ken Carlson and Kevin Holler, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Aitken questioned why, since it was feasible, there was not a door provided to the balcony located off a foyer on the second floor. She pointed out that by installing a door, it allowed for more options than having a window. Mr. Klink explained his reasoning and added that if the client were so inclined, it would be possible.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding “faux” verses a functioning balcony; the location of mailboxes; screening of the private grinder station [a/k/a lift station]; the access driveway; landscaping plans; and photometric plans.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following items: 1) to add a single “store-front” door to the second floor balcony over the main entry to match the style of the windows; 2) move the mailboxes to the main lobby if allowed by the Post Office or if not allowed, move mailboxes to the handicapped platform; 3) at the lift station, install a four-foot, black vinyl-coated, chain-link fence with landscaping around it and that it could be adjusted to accommodate the landscaping; 4) coordinate and revise the entrance with the property owner to the east to use as a joint entrance; 5) use only Pink Tabebuia trees as indicated on the landscape plans; 6) adjust the photometric plans to provide a minimum of two- to three-foot candles within the parking and driveway areas with at least “3.0” at the main entry; and 7) that the applicant would not be coming back to the Committee to modify the architecture of the building in order to accommodate the signage. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business discussed.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business discussed.

**6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

Committee members discussed two sites which they recommended that the Code Compliance Division visit. Ms. Nolan stated that she would convey their remarks appropriately.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Committee Member